

Algorithms for Boolean Function Query Properties

Scott Aaronson*

Computer Science Division, UC Berkeley
Berkeley, CA USA 94720-1776
aaronson@cs.berkeley.edu

Abstract. We present new algorithms to compute fundamental properties of a Boolean function given in truth-table form. Specifically, we give an $O(N^{2.322} \log N)$ algorithm for block sensitivity, an $O(N^{1.585} \log N)$ algorithm for ‘tree decomposition,’ and an $O(N)$ algorithm for ‘quasisymmetry.’ These algorithms are based on new insights into the structure of Boolean functions that may be of independent interest. We also give a subexponential-time algorithm for the space-bounded quantum query complexity of a Boolean function. To prove this algorithm correct, we develop a theory of limited-precision representation of unitary operators, building on work of Bernstein and Vazirani.

Keywords: algorithm; Boolean function; truth table; query complexity; quantum computation.

1 Introduction

The query complexity of Boolean functions, also called black-box or decision-tree complexity, has been well studied for years [3,5,13,14,16,17]. Numerous Boolean function properties relevant to query complexity have been defined, such as sensitivity, block sensitivity, randomized and quantum query complexity, and degree as a real polynomial. But many open questions remain concerning the relationships between the properties. For example, are sensitivity and block sensitivity polynomially related? How small can quantum query complexity be, relative to randomized query complexity? Lacking answers to these questions, we may wish to gain insight into them by using computer analysis of small Boolean functions. But to perform such analysis, we need efficient algorithms to compute the properties in question. Such algorithms are the subject of the present paper.

Let $f : \{0,1\}^n \rightarrow \{0,1\}$ be a Boolean function, and let $N = 2^n$ be the size of the truth table of f . We seek algorithms that have modest running time as a function of N , given the truth table as input. The following table lists some properties important for query complexity, together with the complexities of the most efficient algorithms for them of which we know. In the table, ‘LP’ stands for linear programming reduction.

* Supported by an NSF Graduate Fellowship. Work done at Bell Laboratories / Lucent Technologies.

Query Property	Complexity	Source
Deterministic query complexity $D(f)$	$O(N^{1.585} \log N)$	[7]
Certificate complexity $C(f)$	$O(N^{1.585} \log N)$	[6]
Degree as a real polynomial $\deg(f)$	$O(N^{1.585} \log N)$	This paper
Approximate degree $\widetilde{\deg}(f)$	About $O(N^5)$	Obvious (LP)
Randomized query complexity $R_0(f)$	About $O(N^{7.925})$	Obvious (LP)
Block sensitivity $\text{bs}(f)$	$O(N^{2.322} \log N)$	This paper
Quasisymmetry	$O(N)$	This paper
Tree decomposition	$O(N^{1.585} \log N)$	This paper
Quantum query complexity $Q_2(f)$	Exponential	Obvious
$Q_2(f)$ with $O(\log n)$ -qubit restriction	$O(N^{\text{polylog}(N)})$	This paper

There is also a complexity-theory rationale for studying algorithmic problems such as those considered in this paper. Much effort has been devoted to finding Boolean function properties that do not naturalize in the sense of Razborov and Rudich [15], and that might therefore be useful for proving circuit lower bounds. In our view, it would help this effort to have a better general understanding of the complexity of problems on Boolean function truth tables—both upper and lower bounds. Such problems have been considered since the 1950’s [19], but basic open questions remain, especially in the setting of circuit complexity [11]. This paper addresses the much simpler setting of query complexity.

We do not know of a polynomial-time algorithm to find quantum query complexity; we raise this as an open problem. However, even finding quantum query complexity via exhaustive search is nontrivial, since it involves representing unitary operators with limited-precision arithmetic. The problem is deeper than that of approximating unitary gates with bounded error, which was solved by Bernstein and Vazirani [4]. In Section 7 we resolve the problem, and give an $O(N^{\text{polylog}(N)})$ constant-factor approximation algorithm for bounded-error quantum query complexity if the memory of the quantum computer is restricted to $O(\log n)$ qubits.

We have implemented some of the algorithms discussed in this paper in a linkable C library [1], which is available for download.

2 Preliminaries

A Boolean function f is a total function from $\{0, 1\}^n$ onto $\{0, 1\}$. We use V_f to denote the set of variables of f , and use X , or alternatively $x_1, \dots, x_n$, to denote an input to f . If X is an input, $|X|$ denotes the Hamming weight of X ; if S is a set, $|S|$ denotes the cardinality of S . Particular Boolean functions to which we refer are AND_n , OR_n , and XOR_n , the AND, OR, and XOR functions respectively on n inputs.

3 Previous Work

To our knowledge, no algorithms for block sensitivity, quasisymmetry, tree decomposition, or quantum query complexity have been previously published. But algorithms for simpler query properties have appeared in the literature.

Given a Boolean function f , the *deterministic query complexity* $D(f)$ is the minimum height of a decision tree representing f . Guijarro et al. [7] give a simple $O(N^{1.585} \log N)$ dynamic programming algorithm to compute $D(f)$. That f is given as a truth table is crucial: if f is non-total and only the inputs for which f is defined are given, then computing $D(f)$ is (when phrased as a decision problem) NP-complete [10].

The *certificate complexity* $C(f)$ is the maximum, over all inputs X , of the minimum number of input bits needed to prove the value of $f(X)$. Equivalently, $C(f)$ is the minimum height of a nondeterministic decision tree for f . Czort [6] gives an $O(N^{1.585} \log N)$ algorithm to compute $C(f)$. Again, if f is not given as a full truth table, then computing $C(f)$ is NP-complete [8].

Let $\deg(f)$ be the minimum degree of an n -variate real multilinear polynomial ρ such that, for all $X \in \{0,1\}^n$, $\rho(X) = f(X)$. The following lemma, adapted from Lemma 4 of [5], is easily seen to yield an $O(N^{1.585} \log N)$ dynamic programming algorithm for $\deg(f)$. Say that a function obeys the *parity property* if the number of inputs X with odd parity for which $f(X) = 1$ equals the number of inputs X with even parity for which $f(X) = 1$.

Lemma 1 (Shi and Yao). *$\deg(f)$ equals the size of the largest restriction of f for which the parity property fails.*

4 Block Sensitivity

Block sensitivity, introduced in [13], is a Boolean function property that is used to establish lower bounds. There are several open problems that an efficient algorithm for block sensitivity might help to investigate [13,3,5].

Let X be an input to Boolean function f , and let B (a *block*) be a nonempty subset of V_f . Let $X(B)$ be the input obtained from X by flipping the bits of B .

Definition 1. *A block B is sensitive on X if $f(X) \neq f(X(B))$, and minimal on X if B is sensitive and no proper sub-block S of B is sensitive. Then the block sensitivity $\text{bs}_X(f)$ of X is the maximum number of disjoint minimal (or equivalently, sensitive) blocks on X . Finally $\text{bs}(f)$ is the maximum of $\text{bs}_X(f)$ over all X .*

The obvious algorithm to compute $\text{bs}(f)$ (compute $\text{bs}_X(f)$ for each X using dynamic programming, then take the maximum) uses $\Theta(N^{2.585} \log N)$ time. Here we show how to reduce the complexity to $O(N^{2.322} \log N)$ by exploiting the structure of minimal blocks. Our algorithm has two main stages: one to identify minimal blocks and store them for fast lookup, another to compute $\text{bs}_X(f)$ for each X using only minimal blocks. The analysis proceeds by showing that no Boolean function has too many minimal blocks, and therefore that if the algorithm is slow for some inputs (because of an abundance of minimal blocks), then it must be faster for other inputs.

Algorithm 1 (*computes $\text{bs}(f)$*) *For each input X :*

1. *Identify all sensitive blocks of X ; place them in an AVL tree T .*

2. Loop over all sensitive blocks B in T in lexicographic order $(\{x_1\}, \{x_2\}, \{x_1, x_2\}, \{x_3\}, \dots)$. For each block B , loop over all $2^{n-|B|} - 1$ possible blocks C that properly contain B . Remove from T all such blocks C that are in the tree; such blocks have been identified as non-minimal.
3. Create $2^n - 1$ lists, one list L_S for each nonempty subset S of variables. Then, for each minimal block B in T , insert a copy of B into each list L_S such that $B \subseteq S$. The result is that, for each S , $L_S = 2^S \cap T$, where 2^S is the power set of S .
4. Let a state be a partition (P, Q) of V_f . The set P represents a union of disjoint minimal blocks that have already been selected; the set Q represents the set of variables not yet selected. Then $\text{bs}_X(f) = \theta(\emptyset, V_f)$, where $\theta(P, Q)$ is defined via the recursion $\theta(P, Q) \triangleq 1 + \max_{B \in L_Q} \theta(P \cup B, Q - B)$. Here the maximum evaluates to 0 if L_Q is empty. Compute $\theta(P, Q)$ using depth-first recursion, caching the values of $\theta(P, Q)$ so that each needs to be computed only once.

The block sensitivity is then the maximum of $\text{bs}_X(f)$ over all X .

Let $m(X, k)$ be the number of minimal blocks of X of size k . The analysis of Algorithm 1's running time depends on the following lemma, which shows that large minimal blocks are rare in any Boolean function.

Lemma 2. $\sum_X m(X, k) \leq 2^{n-k+1} \binom{n}{k}$.

Proof. The number of positions that can be occupied by a minimal block of size k is $\binom{n}{k}$ for each input, or $2^n \binom{n}{k}$ for all inputs. Consider an input X with a minimal block $B = \{b_1, \dots, b_k\}$ of size $k > 1$. Block B has $2^k - 1$ nonempty subsets; label them $S_1, \dots, S_{2^k-1}$. By the minimality of B , for each S_i the input $X(S_i)$ has $\{b_1\}, \dots, \{b_k\}$ as minimal blocks if $S_i = B$, and $B - S_i$ as a minimal block if $S_i \neq B$. Therefore $X(S_i)$ cannot have B as a minimal block. So of the $2^n \binom{n}{k}$ positions, only one out of 2^k can be occupied by a minimal block of size k . When $k = 1$ an additional factor of 2 is needed, since $X(B)$ has B as a minimal block. ■

Theorem 1. *Algorithm 1 takes $O(N^{2.322} \log N)$ time.*

Proof. Step 1 takes time $O(N^2 \log N)$, totaled over all inputs. Let us analyze step 2, which identifies the minimal blocks. For each input X , every block B that is selected is minimal, since each non-minimal block in A was removed in a previous iteration. Furthermore, for each block B the number of removals of C blocks is less than $2^{n-|B|}$. Therefore the total number of removals is at most

$$\sum_X \sum_{k=0}^n m(X, k) 2^{n-k} = \sum_{k=0}^n [2^{n-k} \sum_X m(X, k)] \leq \sum_{k=0}^n 2^{2n-2k+1} \binom{n}{k}$$

which sums to $2N^{\log_2 5}$. Since each removal takes $O(\log N)$ time, the total time is $O(N^{2.322} \log N)$.

We next analyze step 3, which creates the $2^n - 1$ lists L_S . Since each minimal block B is contained in $2^{n-|B|}$ sets of variables, the total number of insertions is

at most $\sum_{k=0}^n m(X, k) 2^{n-k}$ for input X . So the time is $O(N^{2.322} \log N)$ by the previous calculation.

Finally we analyze step 4, which computes block sensitivity using the minimal blocks. Each $\theta(P, Q)$ evaluation is performed at most once, and involves looping through a list of minimal blocks contained in Q , with each iteration taking $O(\log N)$ time. For each block B , the number of distinct (P, Q) pairs such that $B \subseteq Q$ is at most $2^{n-|B|}$. Therefore, again, the time for each input X is at most $(\log N) \sum_{k=0}^n m(X, k) 2^{n-k}$ and a bound of $O(N^{2.322} \log N)$ follows. ■

5 Quasisymmetry

A Boolean function $f(X)$ is *symmetric* if its output depends only on $|X|$. Query complexity is well understood for symmetric functions: for example, for all non-constant symmetric f , the deterministic query complexity is n and the zero-error quantum query complexity is $\Theta(n)$ [3]. Thus, a program for analyzing Boolean functions might first check whether a function is symmetric, and if it is, dispense with many expensive tests. We call f *quasisymmetric* if some subset of input bits can be negated to make f symmetric. For example, $f = \text{OR}(x_1, \neg x_2)$ is quasisymmetric but not symmetric. There is an obvious $O(N^2)$ algorithm to test quasisymmetry; here we sketch a linear-time algorithm.

Call a restriction of f a *z-left-restriction* if each variable v_i is fixed if and only if $i \leq z$. Our algorithm recurses through all z -left-restrictions: when it is called on restriction R , it calls itself recursively on $R_{x_{z+1}=0}$ and $R_{x_{z+1}=1}$. If either of these is not quasisymmetric, then the algorithm returns failure; otherwise, the algorithm tries to fit the restrictions together in such a way that R itself is seen to be quasisymmetric. It does this by testing whether $R_{x_{z+1}=0}(|X|) = R_{x_{z+1}=1}(|X| \pm 1)$, with separate routines for the special cases in which $R_{x_{z+1}=0}$ or $R_{x_{z+1}=1}$ is a constant function or a XOR or $1 - \text{XOR}$ function. If the fitting-together process succeeds, then the algorithm returns both the output of R (encoded in compact form, as a symmetric function) and the set of input bits that must be flipped to make R symmetric. Crucially, these return values occupy only $O(n - z)$ bits of space. The algorithm also has subroutines to handle the special cases in which R is a XOR function or a constant function. In these cases R is symmetric no matter which set of input bits is flipped. Since the time used by each invocation is linear in $n - z$, the total time used is $\sum_{z=0}^n 2^z (n - z) = O(N)$. The following lemma shows that the algorithm deals with all of the ways in which a function can be quasisymmetric, which is key to the algorithm's correctness.

Lemma 3. *Let f be a Boolean function on n inputs. If two distinct (and non-complementary) sets of input bits A and B can be flipped to make f symmetric, then f is either XOR_n , $1 - \text{XOR}_n$, or a constant function.*

Proof. Assume without loss of generality that B is empty. Then A has cardinality less than n . We know that $f(X)$ depends only on $|X|$, and also that it depends only on $/X/ \triangleq \sum_{i=1}^n \kappa(x_i)$ where $\kappa(x) = 1 - x$ if $x_i \in A$ and $\kappa(x) = x$ otherwise. Choose any Hamming weight $0 \leq w \leq n - 2$, and consider an input Y with $|Y| = w$ and with two variables v_i and v_j such that $v_i \in A$, $v_j \notin A$,

and $Y(i) = Y(j) = 0$. Let $Z = Y_{Y(i)=1, Y(j)=1}$. We have $|Z| = |Y| + 2$, but on the other hand $|Z| = |Y|$, so $f(Y) = f(Z)$ by symmetry. Again applying symmetry, $f(P) = f(Q)$ whenever $|P| = w$ and $|Q| = w + 2$. Therefore f is either XOR_n , $1 - \text{XOR}_n$, or a constant function. ■

6 Tree Decomposition

Many of the Boolean functions of most interest to query complexity are naturally thought of as trees of smaller Boolean functions: for example, AND-OR trees and majority trees. Thus, given a function f , one of the most basic questions we might ask is whether it has a tree decomposition and if so what it is. In this section we define a sense in which every Boolean function has a unique tree decomposition, and we prove its uniqueness. We also sketch an $O(N^{1.585} \log N)$ algorithm for finding the decomposition.

Definition 2. A distinct variable tree is a tree in which

- (i) Every leaf vertex is labeled with a distinct variable.
- (ii) Every non-leaf vertex v is labeled with a Boolean function having as many variables as v has children, and depending on all of its variables.
- (iii) Every non-leaf vertex has at least two children.

Such a tree represents a Boolean function in the obvious way. We call the tree *trivial* if it contains exactly one vertex.

A *tree decomposition* of f is a separation of f into the smallest possible components, with the exception of $(\neg)\text{AND}_k$, $(\neg)\text{OR}_k$, and $(\neg)\text{XOR}_k$ components (where $(\neg)$ denotes possible negation), which are left intact. The choice of AND, OR, and XOR components is not arbitrary; these are precisely the three components that “associate,” so that, for example, $\text{AND}(x_1, \text{AND}(x_2, x_3)) = \text{AND}(\text{AND}(x_1, x_2), x_3)$. Formally:

Definition 3. A tree decomposition of f is a distinct variable tree representing f such that:

- (i) No vertex is labeled with a function f that can be represented by a nontrivial tree, unless f is $(\neg)\text{AND}_k$, $(\neg)\text{OR}_k$, or $(\neg)\text{XOR}_k$ for some k .
- (ii) No vertex labeled with $(\neg)\text{AND}_k$ has a child labeled with AND_l .
- (iii) No vertex labeled with $(\neg)\text{OR}_k$ has a child labeled with OR_l .
- (iv) No vertex labeled with $(\neg)\text{XOR}_k$ has a child labeled with $(\neg)\text{XOR}_l$.
- (v) Any vertex labeled with a function that is constant on all but one input is labeled with $(\neg)\text{AND}_k$ or $(\neg)\text{OR}_k$.

Let *double-negation* be the operation of negating the output of a function at some non-root vertex v , then negating the corresponding input of the function at v 's parent. Double-negation is a trivial way to obtain distinct decompositions. This caveat aside, we can assert uniqueness:

Theorem 2. Every Boolean function has a unique tree decomposition, up to double-negation.

Proof. Given a vertex v of a distinct variable tree, let $L(v)$ be the set of variables in the subtree of which v is the root. Assume that f is represented by two distinct tree decompositions, T and Z , such that T has a vertex v_T and Z has a vertex v_Z with $L(v_T)$ and $L(v_Z)$ incomparable (i.e. they intersect, but neither contains the other). Then let $A = L(v_T) - L(v_Z)$, $B = L(v_Z) - L(v_T)$, $I = L(v_T) \cap L(v_Z)$, and $U = V_f - L(v_T) - L(v_Z)$. The crucial lemma is the following.

Lemma 4. f is a function of $t(A)$, $i(I)$, $z(B)$, and U , for some Boolean functions t , i , and z .

Proof. We can write T as $T|_U[t_{AI}(A, I), B]$, where t_{AI} is Boolean; similarly we can write Z as $Z|_U[A, z_{IB}(I, B)]$. We have that, for all settings of U , $T|_U[t_{AI}(A, I), B] = Z|_U[A, z_{IB}(I, B)]$. Consider a restriction that fixes all the variables in B . This yields $T|_{U,B}[t_{AI}(A, I)] = Z|_U[A, z_{|B}(I)]$. Therefore, for all restrictions of B , t_{AI} depends on only a single bit obtained from I , namely $z_{|B}(I)$. So we can write $t_{AI}(A, I)$ as $t_\alpha(A, z_{|B}(I))$ for some Boolean t_α —or even more strongly as $t_\alpha(A, t_\beta(I))$, since we know that t_{AI} does not depend on B . By analogous reasoning we can write $z_{IB}(I, B)$ as $z_\alpha(z_\beta(I), B)$ for some functions z_α and z_β . So we have $T|_U[t_\alpha(A, t_\beta(I)), B] = Z|_U[A, z_\alpha(z_\beta(I), B)]$. Next we restrict $A \cup B$, obtaining $T|_{U,B}[t_{\alpha|A}(t_\beta(I))] = Z|_{U,A}[z_{\alpha|B}(z_\beta(I))]$, which implies that, for some functions $T'_{|U,B}$ and $Z'_{|U,A}$, $T'_{|U,B}[t_\beta(I)] = Z'_{|U,A}[z_\beta(I)]$. This shows that $t_\beta(I)$ and $z_\beta(I)$ are equivalent up to negation of output, since T and Z must depend on I for some restriction of $A \cup B$. So we have $T|_U[t_{i(I)}(A), B] = Z|_U[A, z_{i(I)}(B)]$ for some Boolean functions $i(I)$ (henceforth simply i), t_i , and z_i ($i \in \{0, 1\}$). Next we restrict A and i : $T|_{U,A,i}[B] = Z|_{U,A}[z_{i|i}(B)]$. Thus, for all restrictions of A and i , T depends on only a single bit obtained from B , which we'll call $\hat{z}_i(B)$ (and which can be taken equal to $z_{i|i}(B)$). Note that $\hat{z}_i$ does not depend on A . Analogously, for both possible restrictions of i , Z depends on only a single bit obtained from A , which we'll call $\hat{t}_i(A)$. So we can write $T_{*|U}[t_i(A), \hat{z}_i(B)] = Z_{*|U}[\hat{t}_i(A), z_i(B)]$ where $T_{*|U}$ and $Z_{*|U}$ are two-input Boolean functions. We claim that $\hat{z}_0 = \hat{z}_1$ and $\hat{t}_0 = \hat{t}_1$.

There must exist a setting u of U such that $T_{*|U=u}$ depends on both t_i and $\hat{z}_i$. Suppose there exists a setting b of B such that $\hat{z}_0(b) \neq \hat{z}_1(b)$. t_i must be a nonconstant function, so find a constant c such that $T_{*|U=u}[c, \hat{z}_i(B)]$ depends on $\hat{z}_i$, and choose a setting for A and i such that $t_i(A) = c$. (If $T_{*|U=u}$ is a XOR function, then either $c = 0$ or $c = 1$ will work, whereas if $T_{*|U=u}$ is an AND or OR function, then only one value of c will work.) For $T_{*|U=u}$ to be well-defined, we need that whenever $t_i(A) = c$, the value of i is determined (since $\hat{z}_i$ has no access to i). This implies that t_i has the form $t(A) \wedge i$ or $t(A) \wedge \neg i$ for some function t . Therefore $T_{*|U=u}$ can be written as $T_{tiz|U=u}[t(A), i, \hat{z}_i(B)]$ for some function $T_{tiz|U=u}$.

Now repeat the argument for $Z_{*|U=u}$. We obtain that $Z_{*|U=u}$ can be written as $Z_{tiz|U=u}[\hat{t}_i(A), i, z(B)]$ for some functions $Z_{tiz|U=u}$ and z . Therefore $T_{tiz|U=u}[t(A), i, \hat{z}_i(B)] = Z_{tiz|U=u}[\hat{t}_i(A), i, z(B)]$. So we can take $\hat{z}_i(B) =$

$z(B)$ (equivalently $\widehat{t}_i(A) = t(A)$), and write $T_{tiz|U=u}$ (or $Z_{tiz|U=u}$) as $T_{tiz|U=u}[t(A), i(I), z(B)]$. ■

We now prove the main theorem: that f has a unique tree decomposition, up to double-negation. From Lemma 4, v_T effectively has as inputs the two bits $t(A)$ and $i(I)$, and v_Z the two bits $i(I)$ and $z(B)$. Thus we can check, by enumeration, that either v_T and v_Z are labeled with the same function, and that function is either AND_k , $\neg \text{AND}_k$, OR_k , or $\neg \text{OR}_k$; or v_T and v_Z are both labeled with either XOR_k or $\neg \text{XOR}_k$. (Note that k can be different for v_T and for v_Z .)

In either case, for all u there exists a function $T_{tiz|U=u}$, taking $t(A)$, $i(I)$, and $z(B)$ as input, that captures all that needs to be known about $A \cup I \cup B$. Furthermore, since t_{AI} and z_{IB} do not depend on u , neither does $T_{tiz|U=u}$, and we can write it as T_{tiz} . Let v_m be the unique vertex in T such that $L(v_m)$ contains $A \cup I \cup B$ and is minimal among all $L(v_i)$ sets that do so. If v_m is labeled with $(\neg) \text{AND}_k$, $(\neg) \text{OR}_k$, or $(\neg) \text{XOR}_k$, then v_T cannot be a vertex of T . If v_m is labeled with some other function, then $L(v_m) \neq A \cup I \cup B$ and the function at v_m is represented by a nontrivial tree. Either way we obtain a contradiction.

Now that we have ruled out the possibility of incomparable subtrees, we can establish uniqueness. Call a set $V \subseteq V_f$ *unifiable* if there exists a vertex v_* , in some decomposition of f , such that $L(v_*) = V$. Let C be the collection of all unifiable sets. We have established that no pair $V_1, V_2 \in C$ is incomparable: either $V_1 \cap V_2 = \emptyset$, $V_1 \subseteq V_2$, or $V_2 \subseteq V_1$. We claim that any decomposition must contain a vertex v_i with $L(v_i) = V_i$ for every $V_i \in C$. For suppose that V_i is not represented in some decomposition F . Certainly $V_i \neq V_f$, so let V_P be the *parent set* of V_i in F : that is, the unique minimal set such that $V_i \subset V_P$ and there exists a vertex v_P in F with $L(v_P) = V_P$. Then the function at v_P is represented by a nontrivial tree, containing a vertex v_i with $L(v_i) = V_i$ —were it not, then v_i could not be a vertex in any decomposition. Furthermore, the function at v_P cannot be $(\neg) \text{AND}_k$, $(\neg) \text{OR}_k$, or $(\neg) \text{XOR}_k$. If it were, then again v_i could not be a vertex in any decomposition, since it would need to be labeled correspondingly with $(\neg) \text{AND}_k$, $(\neg) \text{OR}_k$, or $(\neg) \text{XOR}_k$. Having determined the unique set of vertices that comprise any tree decomposition, the vertices' labels are also determined up to double-negation. ■

We now sketch an algorithm to construct the tree decomposition. In a distinct variable tree, let $L(v)$ be the set of variables in the subtree of which v is the root. Then given a subset G of V_f , we can clearly decide in linear time whether a distinct variable tree representing f could have a vertex u with $L(u) = G$. So we can construct a decomposition in $O(N^2)$ time, by checking whether a vertex u could have $L(u) = G$ for each subset $G \subseteq V_f$ satisfying $2 \leq |G| \leq n - 1$.

The key insight for reducing the time to $O(N^{1.585} \log N)$ is to represent each restriction by a concise *codeword*, which takes up only $O(n)$ bits rather than $2^{|G|}$ bits. We create the codewords recursively, starting with the smallest restrictions and working up to larger ones. The codewords need to satisfy the following conditions:

- Two restrictions g and h over the same set of variables get mapped to identical codewords if and only if $g = h$.
- If g is the negation of h , then this fact is easy to tell given the codewords of g and h .
- If a restriction is constant, then this fact is also easy to tell given its codeword.

We can satisfy this condition by building up a binary tree of restrictions at each recursive call, then assigning each restriction a codeword based on its position in the tree. For all $G \neq \emptyset$, each object inserted into the tree is a concatenation of two codewords of size- $(|G| - 1)$ restrictions.

After the codewords are created, a second phase of the algorithm deletes redundant AND_k , OR_k , and $(\neg)\text{XOR}_k$ vertices. This phase looks for vertices u and v with $L(u)$ and $L(v)$ incomparable, which, as a consequence of Theorem 2, can only have arisen by AND_k , OR_k , or $(\neg)\text{XOR}_k$. Both phases effectively perform an $O(\log N)$ -time operation for all subsets of subsets of V_f , so the complexity is $O(N^{1.585} \log N)$.

7 Quantum Query Complexity

The quantum query complexity of a Boolean function f is the minimum number of oracle queries needed by a quantum computer to evaluate f . Here we are concerned only with the bounded-error query complexity $Q_2(f)$ (defined in [3]), since approximating unitary matrices with finite precision introduces bounded error into any quantum algorithm. A quantum query algorithm Γ proceeds by an alternating sequence of $T + 1$ unitary transformations and T query transformations: $U_0 \rightarrow Q_1 \rightarrow U_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow Q_T \rightarrow U_T$. Then $Q_2(f)$ is the minimum of T over all Γ that compute f with bounded error.

There are several open problems that an efficient algorithm to compute $Q_2(f)$ might help to investigate [2,3,5]. Unfortunately, we do not know of such an algorithm. Here we show that, if we limit the number of qubits, we can obtain a subexponential-time approximation algorithm via careful exhaustive search.

7.1 Overview of Result

For what follows, it will be convenient to extend the quantum oracle model to allow intermediate observations. With an unlimited workspace, this cannot change the number of queries needed [4]. In the space-bounded setting, however, it might make a difference.

We define a *composite algorithm* Γ' to be an alternating sequence $\Gamma_1 \rightarrow D_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow \Gamma_t \rightarrow D_t$. Each Γ_i is a quantum query algorithm that uses T_i queries and at most m qubits of memory for some $m \geq \log_2 n + 2$. When Γ_i terminates a basis state $|\psi_i\rangle$ is observed. Each D_i is a *decision point*, which takes as input the sequence $|\psi_1\rangle, \dots, |\psi_t\rangle$, and as output decides whether to (1) halt and return $f = 0$, (2) halt and return $f = 1$, or (3) continue to Γ_{t+1} . (The final decision point, D_t , must select between (1) and (2).) There are no computational restrictions placed on the decision points. However, a decision point cannot modify the quantum algorithms that come later in the sequence; it

can only decide whether to continue with the sequence. For a particular input, let p_k be the probability, over all runs of Γ' , that quantum algorithm Γ_k is invoked. Then Γ' uses a total number of queries $\sum_{k=1}^t p_k T_k$.

We define the space-bounded quantum query complexity $SQ_{2,m}(f)$ to be the minimum number of queries used by any composite algorithm that computes f with error probability at most $1/3$ and that is restricted to m qubits. We give an approximation algorithm for $SQ_{2,m}(f)$ taking time $2^{O(4^m mn)}$, which when $m = O(\log n)$ is $O(N^{\text{polylog}(N)})$. The approximation ratio is $\sqrt{22}/3 + \epsilon$ for any $\epsilon > 0$. The difficulty in proving the result is as follows.

A unitary transformation is represented by a continuous-valued matrix, which might suggest that the quantum model of computation is analog rather than digital. But Bernstein and Vazirani [4] showed that, for a quantum computation taking T steps, the matrix entries need to be accurate only to within $O(\log T)$ bits of precision in the bounded-error model. However, when we try represent unitary transformations on a computer with finite precision, a new problem arises. On the one hand, if we allow only matrices that are exactly unitary, we may not be able to approximate every unitary matrix. So we also need to admit matrices that are *almost* unitary. For example, we might admit a matrix if the norm of each row is sufficiently close to 1, and if the inner product of each pair of distinct rows is sufficiently close to 0. But how do we know that every such matrix is close to some actual unitary matrix? If it is not, then the transformation it represents cannot even approximately be realized by a quantum computer.

We resolve this issue as follows. First, we show that every almost-unitary matrix is close to some unitary matrix in a standard metric. Second, we show that every unitary matrix is close to some almost-unitary matrix representable with limited precision. Third, we upper-bound the precision that suffices for a quantum algorithm, given a fixed accuracy that the algorithm needs to attain.

An alternative approach to approximating $SQ_{2,m}(f)$ would be to represent each unitary matrix as a product of elementary gates. Kitaev [12] and independently Solovay [18] showed that a $2^m \times 2^m$ unitary matrix can be represented with arbitrary accuracy $\delta > 0$ by a product of $2^{O(m) \text{polylog}(1/\delta)}$ unitary gates. But this yields a $2^{2^{O(m) \text{polylog}(mn)}}$ algorithm, which is slower than ours. Perhaps the construction or its analysis can be improved; in any case, though, this approach is not as natural for the setting of query complexity.

7.2 Almost-Unitary Matrices

Let $u \bullet v$ denote the conjugate inner product of u and v . The distance $|A - B|$ between matrices $A = (a_{ij})$ and $B = (b_{ij})$ in the $L_{\max}$ norm is defined to be $\max_{i,j} |a_{ij} - b_{ij}|$.

Definition 4. A matrix A is q -almost-unitary if $|I - AA^\dagger| < q$.

In the following lemma, we start an almost-unitary matrix A and construct an actual unitary matrix U that is close to A in the $L_{\max}$ norm.

Lemma 5. Let A be a q -almost-unitary $s \times s$ matrix, with $s \geq 2$ and $q \leq 1/4s$. Then there exists a unitary matrix U such that $|A - U| < 4.91q\sqrt{s}$.

Proof. We first normalize each row A_i so that $A_i \bullet A_i = 1$. For each entry a_{ij} , $|a_{ij}/(A_i \bullet A_i) - a_{ij}| = |a_{ij}| |1 - (A_i \bullet A_i)| / |A_i \bullet A_i| < q(1+q)/(1-q)$. We next form a unitary matrix B from A by using the Classical Gram-Schmidt (CGS) orthogonalization procedure (see [9] for details). The idea is to project A_2 to make it orthogonal to A_1 , then project A_3 to make it orthogonal to both A_1 and A_2 , and so on. Initially we set $B_1 \leftarrow A_1$. Then for each $2 \leq i \leq s$, we set $B_i \leftarrow A_i - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} (A_i \bullet B_j) B_j$. Therefore $A_i \bullet B_k = (A_i \bullet A_k) - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} (A_i \bullet B_j)(A_k \bullet B_j)$.

We need to show that the discrepancy between A and B does not increase too drastically as the recursion proceeds. Let $\sigma_k = \max_i A_i \bullet B_k$. By hypothesis, $\sigma_1 < q$. Then $\sigma_k \leq \sigma_1 + \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \sigma_j^2$. Assume that $\sigma_k < q + 4q^2s$ for all $k \leq K$. By induction, $\sigma_{K+1} < q + K(q + 4q^2s)^2 \leq q + 4q^2s$ since $q \leq 1/4s$ and $K \leq s$. So for all k , $\sigma_k < q + 4q^2s$.

Let $\phi = |A - B|$. By the definition of B , $\phi \leq \sigma_1 |w_1| + \dots + \sigma_s |w_s|$ where w is a column of B . Since $|w_1|^2 + \dots + |w_s|^2 = 1$, ϕ is maximized when $w_i = \sigma_i \sqrt{s} / (\sigma_1 + \dots + \sigma_s)$, or $\phi \leq \sigma_1^2 + \dots + \sigma_s^2 \sqrt{s} / (\sigma_1 + \dots + \sigma_s) \leq (q + 4q^2s)^2 \sqrt{s} / q$.

Adding $q(1+q)/(1-q)$ from normalization yields a quantity less than $(4 + 9\sqrt{2}/14)q\sqrt{s} \approx 4.91q\sqrt{s}$. This can be seen by working out the arithmetic for the worst case of $s = 2$, $q = 1/4s$. ■

The next lemma, which is similar to Lemma 6.1.3 of [4], is a sort of converse to Lemma 5: we start with an arbitrary unitary matrix, and show that truncating its entries to a precision $\delta > 0$ produces an almost-unitary matrix.

Lemma 6. *Let U and V be $s \times s$ matrices with $s \geq 2$ and $|U - V| < \delta$. If U is unitary, then V is $(2\delta\sqrt{s} + \delta^2s)$ -almost-unitary.*

Proof. First, $U_i \bullet U_i = \sum_{k=1}^s |u_k + \gamma_k|^2 = 1 + \sum_{k=1}^s (u_k \gamma_k^* + u_k^* \gamma_k + \gamma_k \gamma_k^*)$ where the u_k 's are entries of U and the γ_k 's are error terms satisfying $|\gamma_k| < \delta$. So by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, $U_i \bullet U_i$ differs from 1 by at most $2\delta\sqrt{s} + \delta^2s$. Second, for $i \neq j$, $U_i \bullet U_j = \sum_{k=1}^s (u_k + \gamma_k)(u_k + \eta_k)^*$ where the γ_k 's and η_k 's are error terms, and the argument proceeds analogously. ■

7.3 Searching for Quantum Algorithms

In this section we use the results on almost-unitary matrices to construct an algorithm. First we need a lemma about error buildup in quantum algorithms, which is similar to Corollary 3.4.4 of [4] (though the proof technique is different).

Lemma 7. *Let $U_1, \dots, U_T$ be $s \times s$ unitary matrices, $\widehat{U}_1, \dots, \widehat{U}_T$ be $s \times s$ arbitrary matrices, and v be an $s \times 1$ vector with $\|v\|_2 = 1$. Suppose that, for all i , $|\widehat{U}_i - U_i| < 1/cs$, where $c > T/2$. Then $\widehat{U}_1 \cdots \widehat{U}_T v$ differs from $U_1 \cdots U_T v$ by at most $2T/[\sqrt{s}(2c - T)]$ in the L_2 norm.*

Proof. For each i , let $E_i = \widehat{U}_i - U_i$. By hypothesis, every entry of E_i has magnitude at most $1/cs$; thus, each row or column w of E_i has $\|w\|_2 \leq 1/(c\sqrt{s})$. Then $\widehat{U}_1 \cdots \widehat{U}_T v = (U_1 + E_1) \cdots (U_T + E_T) v$. The right-hand side, when expanded, has 2^T terms. Any term containing k matrices E_i has L_2 norm at most $s^{-1/2}c^{-k}$,

and can therefore add at most $c^{-k}/\sqrt{s}$ to the discrepancy with $U_1 \cdots U_T v$. So the total discrepancy is at most $s^{-1/2} \sum_{k=1}^T \binom{T}{k} (1/c)^k < s^{-1/2} (e^{T/c} - 1)$. Since $d \ln t / dt$ evaluated at $t = 2c$ is $1/2c$ and since $\ln t$ is concave, $\ln(2c+T) - \ln(2c-T) \geq 2T/2c = T/c$ when $T < 2c$. Therefore $e^{T/c} \leq (2c+T)/(2c-T)$ and the discrepancy is at most $2T/[\sqrt{s}(2c-T)]$ in the L_2 norm. ■

Applying Lemmas 5, 6, and 7, we now prove the main theorem.

Theorem 3. *There exists an approximation algorithm for $SQ_{2,m}(f)$ taking time $2^{O(4^m mn)}$, with approximation ratio $\sqrt{22}/3 + \epsilon$.*

Proof. Given f , we want, subject to the following two constraints, to find an algorithm Γ that approximates f with a minimum number of queries. First, Γ uses at most m qubits, meaning that $s = 2^m$ and the relevant matrices are $2^m \times 2^m$. Second, the correctness probability of Γ is known to a constant accuracy $\pm \epsilon$. Certainly the number T of queries never needs to be more than n , for, although each quantum algorithm is space-bounded, the *composite* algorithm need not be. Let λ be the $L_{\max}$ error we can tolerate in the matrices, and let Δ be the resultant L_2 error in the final states. Setting $c = 1/(\lambda 2^m)$, by Lemma 7 we have $\Delta \leq 2n/ [2^{m/2} (2^{1-m}/\lambda - n)]$. From the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, one can show that $\epsilon \leq 2\Delta$. Then solving for $1/\lambda$, $1/\lambda \leq 2^{m/2} n (2/\epsilon + 1)$ which, since ϵ is constant, is $O(2^{m/2} n)$. Solving for c , we can verify that $c > T/2$, as required by Lemma 7. If we generate almost-unitary matrices, they need to be within λ of actual unitary matrices. By Lemma 5 we can use $\lambda/(4.91\sqrt{s})$ -almost-unitary matrices. Finally we need to ensure that we approximate every unitary matrix. Let δ be the needed precision. Invoking Lemma 6, we set $\lambda/(4.91\sqrt{s}) \geq 2\delta\sqrt{s} + \delta^2 s$ and obtain that $\delta \leq \max [\lambda/(9.82s), \lambda^{1/2}/(2.22s^{3/4})]$ is sufficient.

Therefore the number of bits of precision needed per entry, $\log(1/\delta)$, is $O(m)$. We thus need only $O(4^m mn)$ bits to specify Γ , and can search through all possible Γ in time $2^{O(4^m mn)}$. The amount of time needed to evaluate a composite algorithm Γ' is polynomial in m and n , and is absorbed into the exponent. The approximation algorithm is this: first let $\epsilon > 0$ be a constant at most 0.0268, and let $\omega = \frac{22}{9} + \frac{4}{3}\epsilon - 8\epsilon^2$. Then find the smallest T such that the maximum probability of correctness over all T -query algorithms Γ' is at least $2/3 - \epsilon$ (subject to $\pm \epsilon$ uncertainty), and return $T\sqrt{\omega}$. The algorithm achieves an approximation ratio of $\sqrt{\omega}$, for the following reason. First, $T \leq SQ_{2,m}(f)$. Second, $\omega T \geq SQ_{2,m}(f)$, since by repeating the optimal algorithm Γ^* until it returns the same answer twice (which takes either two or three repetitions), the correctness probability can be boosted above $2/3$. Finally, a simple calculation reveals that Γ^* returns the same answer twice after expected number of invocations ω . ■

8 Acknowledgments

I thank Umesh Vazirani for advice and encouragement, Rob Pike and Lorenz Huelsbergen for sponsoring the Bell Labs internship during which this work was done and for helpful discussions, Andris Ambainis and an anonymous reviewer for comments and corrections, Wim van Dam for a simplification in Section 7, and Peter Bro Miltersen for correspondence.

References

1. S. Aaronson, Boolean Function Wizard 1.0 (software library), <http://www.cs.berkeley.edu/~aaronson/bfw>, 2000.
2. A. Ambainis, *Quantum lower bounds by quantum arguments*, in Proceedings of the Thirty-Second Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, ACM, Portland, OR, 2000, pp. 636–643.
3. R. Beals, H. Buhrman, R. Cleve, M. Mosca, and R. de Wolf, *Quantum lower bounds by polynomials*, in Proc. 39'th IEEE Symp. on Foundations of Comp. Sci., 1998, pp. 352–361.
4. E. Bernstein and U. Vazirani, *Quantum complexity theory*, SIAM J. Comput., 26:5(1997), pp. 1411–1473.
5. H. Buhrman and R. de Wolf, *Complexity measures and decision tree complexity: a survey*, to appear in Theoretical Comp. Sci.
6. S. L. A. Czort, *The complexity of minimizing disjunctive normal form formulas*, Master's Thesis, University of Aarhus, 1999.
7. D. Guijarro, V. Lavín, and V. Raghavan, *Exact learning when irrelevant variables abound*, Information Proc. Lett., 70(1999), pp. 233–239.
8. T. Hancock, T. Jiang, M. Li, and J. Tromp, *Lower bounds on learning decision lists and trees*, Information and Computation, 126(1996), pp. 114–122.
9. K. Hoffman and R. Kunze, *Linear Algebra*, Prentice Hall, 1971.
10. L. Hyafil and R. L. Rivest, *Constructing optimal binary decision trees is NP-complete*, Information Proc. Lett., 5(1976), pp. 15–17.
11. V. Kabanets and J-Y Cai, *Circuit minimization problem*, in Proceedings of the Thirty-Second Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, ACM, Portland, OR, 2000, pp. 73–79.
12. A. Yu. Kitaev, *Quantum computations: algorithms and error correction*, Russian Math. Surveys, 52:6(1997), pp. 1191–1249.
13. N. Nisan, *CREW PRAMs and decision trees*, SIAM J. Comput., 20:6(1991), pp. 999–1007.
14. N. Nisan and M. Szegedy, *On the degree of Boolean functions as real polynomials*, Comput. Complexity, 4:4(1994), pp. 301–313. Earlier version in STOC'92.
15. A. A. Razborov and S. Rudich, *Natural proofs*, J. Comput. System Sci., 55(1997), pp. 24–35.
16. D. Rubinstein, *Sensitivity vs. block sensitivity of Boolean functions*, Combinatorica, 15:2(1995), pp. 297–299.
17. M. Saks and A. Wigderson, *Probabilistic Boolean decision trees and the complexity of evaluating game trees*, in Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, IEEE Computer Society, Ontario, Canada, 1986, pp. 29–38.
18. R. Solovay, *Lie groups and quantum circuits*, talk at workshop on Mathematics of Quantum Computation, Mathematical Sciences Research Institute, Spring 2000.
19. B. A. Trakhtenbrot, *A survey of Russian approaches to perebor (brute-force search) algorithms*, Annals of the History of Computing, 6:4(1984), pp. 384–400.